

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/705,914 | 11/13/2003 | Gee-Sung Chae | 8733.894.00-US | 7320 | |
| 30827 MCKENNA I | 7590 04/24/200 ONG & ALDRIDGE I | EXAMINER | | | |
| 1900 K STREET, NW | | | NGUYEN, LAUREN | | |
| WASHINGTO | N, DC 20006 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2871 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 04/24/2009 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/705,914 | | CHAE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | LAUREN NGUYEN | 2871 | |

| | LAUREN NGUYEN | 2871 | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 26 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | ALLOWANCE. | | | | | |
| ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of the application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.1.31; or (3) a Reques for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (| ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | date of the final rejection | n. | | | | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(| n). | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | lension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | |
| | lianes with 27 CER 41 27 must be 6 | Slad within two worth | a of the date of | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | appeal. Since | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed) | nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); | E below); | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | ter form for appeal by materially red | lucing or simplifying ti | ne issues for | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116 | 21 See attached Notice of Non Co. | mpliant Amandment / | DTOL 224) | | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | ripliant Amendment (| F 1 OL-324). | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s)would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided in the control of the co | | be entered and an e | xplanation of | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 9,-11, 13, 14. | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-8 and 17-21. | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu | t does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| (D. : I.N.) | | | | | | | |
| /David Nelms/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2871 | | | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance becase the newly added claim elements and limitations raise new issue that would require further consideration and/or search.